

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
6 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**  
7

8 LOUISIANA MUNICIPAL POLICE  
9 EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT  
10 SYSTEM,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 STEPHEN A. WYNN, et al.,

14 Defendants.  
15

2:12-CV-509 JCM (GWF)

16 **ORDER**

17 Presently before the court is plaintiffs Louisiana Municipal Employees' Retirement System,  
18 Excavators Union Local 731 Welfare Fund, and Maryanne Solak's motion for leave to amend  
19 verified consolidated shareholder derivative complaint. (Doc. # 126). Defendants have not  
20 responded.

21 Pursuant to Local Rule 7-2(d), an opposing party's failure to file a timely response to any  
22 motion constitutes the party's consent to the granting of the motion. LR 7-2. The instant motion  
23 seeks to amend plaintiffs' verified consolidated shareholder derivative complaint. In light of  
24 defendants' failure to respond, the court finds granting the motion appropriate. However, in good  
25 faith, the court also turns to the merits of the motion.

26 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a) provides that leave to amend "shall be freely given  
27 when justice so requires." The Supreme Court has interpreted Rule 15(a) and confirmed the liberal  
28

1 standard district courts must apply when granting such leave. In *Foman v. Davis*, 371 U.S. 178  
2 (1962), the Court explained: “In the absence of any apparent or declared reason – such as undue  
3 delay, bad faith or dilatory motive on the part of the movant, repeated failure to cure deficiencies by  
4 amendments previously allowed, undue prejudice to the opposing party by virtue of allowance of the  
5 amendment, futility of the amendment, etc. – the leave sought should, as the rules require, be ‘freely  
6 given.’” *Id.* at 182. In addition to the Rule 15(a) requirements, the local rules of federal practice in  
7 the District of Nevada require that a plaintiff submit a proposed, amended complaint along with a  
8 motion to amend. LR 15-1(a).

9 The court notes that plaintiffs have complied with Local Rule 15-1 and attached the proposed  
10 amended pleading. Further, the court finds none of the illustrative examples given by the Supreme  
11 Court in *Foman* as grounds to deny leave here.

12 Accordingly,

13 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that plaintiffs’ motion for leave  
14 to amend verified consolidated shareholder derivative complaint (doc. # 126) be, and the same  
15 hereby is, GRANTED.

16 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiffs file the proposed amended verified consolidated  
17 shareholder derivative complaint with the court within seven (7) days of entry of this order.

18 DATED April 1, 2013.

19  
20   
21 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**